

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 4-21 are pending and stand rejected. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's thoughtful reconsideration and that the Examiner pass the application on to issuance.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §103:** Claims 1 and 4-21 were rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,623,527 issued to Hamzy in view of USPN 5,941,954 issued to Kalajan.

Hamzy is directed to a method in which a web page requested by a client is intercepted and modified to include a control button for a network service. The modified web page is passed on to and displayed by the client. A user can then select the added control button to cause a specified action. See Hamzy, Abstract, Fig. 3, Col. 4, lines 33-65.

Kalajan is directed to network message redirection in which a software program running on a client listens to a communications port and redirects messages received on that port to a network resource. See Kalajan, Abstract.

**Claim 1** directed to a client configurable web based imaging page redirector system and recites the following elements:

1. at least one processor at a client programmed with client software for receiving content from an imaging source at an external web site, wherein the content includes a designator to take a processing action with respect to at least a portion of the content;
2. redirector software loaded in the client that is operable to use a programmatic interface to obtain information;
3. the redirector software being operable to access the programmatic interface to obtain the information;

4. the redirector software being operable to choose at least one destination reference-based on the information; and
5. the redirector software being operable to automatically redirect the client to the at least one destination reference.

The Examiner contends that Hamzy teaches the elements 1-4. The Examiner admits that Hamzy is silent with reference to redirector software being operable to automatically redirect the client to the at least one destination reference. For this deficiency, the Examiner Relies on Kalajan.

With respect to the second and third elements listed above, the Examiner asserts that Hamzi, col. 5, lines 40-48 and col. 6, lines 19-26 teaches "redirector software loaded in the client that is operable to use a programmatic interface to obtain information" and "redirector software being executed to access the programmatic interface to obtain the information." The relevance of the cited passages is suspect as it neither mentions nor suggests redirector software executed to access a programmatic interface to obtain information. To illustrate, the cited passage is reproduced as follows:

In addition to the HTML for the print button's appearance, the proxy server also inserts the HTML used when a button is selected by the user. The embedded HTML identifies the requested web page, the requesting client and the path to the print server which controls the requested printer. The print button may actually comprise several individual selections or push buttons, each for one of a plurality of printers which may be controlled by the same printer server or different print servers.

Hamzi, col. 5, lines 40-48.

Assuming that the user has selected the print button, the browser determines that this is so, step 209. Next, the browser refers to the embedded HTML to determine the appropriate action to take, i.e. send a print request including identifying information to the appropriate URL. As mentioned above, the URL will be directed to an appropriate proxy server in the network.

Hamzy, col. 6, lines 19-26 (emphasis added).

These passage merely mentions that a proxy server can insert HTML for a button's appearance and for use when a button is selected. Upon selection of a button, a print request that includes information is sent to an URL.

Claim 1 recites redirector software operable to use a programmatic interface to obtain information and to access the programmatic interface to obtain the information. Hamzy mentions nothing of the use of a programmatic interface to obtain information. To the contrary, Hamzy teaches sending a request to an URL where that requests includes information. Hamzy mentions nothing of a request to obtain information

With respect to the fifth element of Claim 1, listed above, the Examiner, citing Kalajan, col. 3, lines 4-8 and col. 5, lines 29-42, asserts that Kalajan teaches redirector software being operable to automatically redirect the client to the at least one destination reference. Those passages simply refer to software operating on a client that redirects messages addresses to one of the client's ports – redirecting those messages to a network resource. Kalajan teaches redirecting messages. Claim 1, on the other hand, recites redirector software that is operable to redirect a client.

Therefore, the combination of Hamzy and Kalajan fails to teach or suggest redirector software loaded in the client that is operable to (1) use a programmatic interface to obtain information, (2) access the programmatic interface to obtain the information, and (3) to automatically redirect the client to the at least one destination reference.


For at least these reasons, Claim 1 is patentable over Hamzy as are Claims 4-14 due at least in part to their dependence from Claim 1.

**Claim 15** is directed to method implementation of Claim 1. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 15 and Claims 16-20 which depended form Claim 15.

**Claim 21** is directed to a program product implementation of Claim 1. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so is Claim 21.

**CONCLUSION:** Claims 1 and 4-21 are felt to be in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,  
Shell S. Simpson

By   
Jack H. McKinney  
Reg. No. 45,685

May 8, 2006